

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-18, and 20 remain in the application and have not been further amended.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Liao et al. in view of Lennie et al. and further in view of Bateman et al.

As previously noted according to the present invention, the server can be set up with a scheduler that permits the user to set up a scheduling list regarding the data to be input in the future based on control data from the client devices and also a table-creating system that creates a pre-set table for presetting the reproduction destined data to be input in the future. Such a scheduler includes a time keeping piece.

This feature is recited in the independent claims of this application.

In the rejection of the claim the examiner notes that neither Liao et al. nor Lennie et al. disclose this feature.

Bateman et al. is cited for allegedly disclosing such a scheduler. Nevertheless, it is respectfully noted that in Bateman et al. the anticipated wait time and call set up and scheduling options are transmitted back to the caller, that is, the client, from the server unit. Contrary to this feature,

according to the present invention, it is the user that sets up the schedule and the user inputs to the server the schedule and the control data from the client device. This feature is positively recited in the claims in the present application.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Bateman et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Liao et al. and Lennie et al. relating to the schedule inputting means that inputs a schedule list from the user for designating reproduction-destined data to be input in the future, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims.

Accordingly, in view of the remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in the claims is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:tb